

F

83

.F33



Letters to
James Fener, Esq.
in 1811 and 1831



Class F 8 c

Book . 1 3 3

LETTERS

TO

JAMES FENER, ESQ.

IN

1811 AND 1831.

427
670

703
F33

INTRODUCTION.

"A grievous burden was thy birth to me—
Techy and wayward was thy infancy—
Thy age confirmed, *proud, subtle, sly* and crabbed ;
What comfortable hour canst thou name
That ever graced *me* in *thy* company?"

RICHARD III.

THE DEMOCRACY OF RHODE-ISLAND, the nursing mother of a wayward son, who has done nought but wound the bosom that would have fostered him, may well address to JAMES FENNER, at this time, the heavy words of the mother of the headstrong tyrant Richard. Indeed, what day, what hour, can James Fenner name, in which he ever graced republicanism by his company? When did he ever repose on her bosom, and hers *alone*, for sustenance? The political history of James Fenner, is a history of COALITION with political *foes* to humble political *friends*.

The partizans of his Excellency are loud in their assertions that he is and ever has been a UNIFORM REPUBLICAN. Let me draw the veil a moment, and present to his Excellency a *true portrait*, which has so long been concealed from view, that he and his friends talk as securely as if the world had forgotten it. The touches are from *his own political friends*. The likeness was irresistably *striking* when it was first drawn by the pencil of one of the most talented Republicans of the Wheaton party, in 1811. It has wonderfully improved by *age*—the colors have become *faster*, the outline more *distinct*, and with the *re-touching* which is now given it, to bring it down to modern times, there is no one, however dull, who can mistake the original it was intended for.

Republicans of Rhode-Island, read what our own party said of James Fenner in 1811, when he had forfeited their confidence and was dismissed by *them* from office. Read what is now said by the same party, of the subsequent political life of his Excellency, and then say if you can support James Fenner as an uniform and consistent REPUBLICAN?

A LETTER
TO
JAMES FENNER, ESQ.

—ooo—

SIR—

Among Republicans,—as we have often before had occasion to intimate to you,—*your* republicanism has always been a subject of doubt and distrust. Your hostile and inconsistent conduct has compelled us to fear—not only your capricious humor, but the soundness of your principles. The most indulgent allowances have been made for your weakness, your inexperience, your wayward temper—and, after all, we cannot help perceiving, that there is something more than can be thus excused or palliated. Something more than charity will cover. Something Sir, rotten at the core. To remain silent, under these impressions of your unworthiness, would be to trifle with our own characters; to confound the cause and principles of republicanism with yours, and, in the result, to involve them and ourselves in your disgrace.

The partial review which we sometime since took of your conduct, served only to enrage, instead of reforming you. Indeed, you have never before allowed us an occasion upon which we could claim the privilege of remonstrating with you, without a certainty of exciting your derision. Heretofore we could see you only in the ranks of our enemies. To them we witnessed your condescensions. But to Republicans, you have presented a front of scorn and defiance. Last year, for the first time, it suited your humor or your interest to dissolve your connexion with the federal party. How this rupture was produced, and the merits of it on your part, we shall see hereafter. You thought it necessary, at the time, to announce this event publicly in the *Phoenix*, in order that the dissolution might be as extensively known as the connexion had been; and that your former co-partners might be no longer trusted on *your credit*. With this advertisement of your breach with your for-

mer friends, you were satisfied. You did not favor us with any explanations, much less apologies, for your past hostile conduct. You did not condescend to tell us, why you had joined, and so long acted with our enemies. Why you had persecuted our friends and ourselves; nor to give us the smallest assurance, that we had any thing better to hope for in future.

In short, though you had left the federalists, you did not even seek a reconciliation with Republicans; taking no manner of notice of us, our complaints, or injuries. On the contrary, you still continued to persecute us as inveterately as ever:—relying now upon your own power to crush us, without the aid of our other enemies. At last, the period has arrived when you see your old associates the federalists arrayed against you. And now, while you still retain the same views and spirit of enmity towards us, you call upon us to support you. You have placed us, therefore, in a situation, in which we are compelled to speak in defence of our own characters.

To remain silent and passive, under the circumstances to which you have reduced us.—To support you after all that has passed, without inquiry or scruple, would be an abandonment of our own cause and principles, and a tame submission to your single will. Thus situated—that our silence may not hereafter be imputed to us as an approbation of your views, your apostacy and persecutions; and that the true cause of Republicanism may be preserved distinct from, and uncontaminated by, any connexion or affinity with such principles as have governed your conduct; it is our duty here to record, with our protest, the most conspicuous parts of your political history. I invite you to accompany me in this review. It may not be unprofitable to you. It will refresh your memory, if it does not quicken your conscience. At any rate, Sir, it will serve to convince you, that your plan of governing Republicans, and bending them to your will by persecution, is as preposterous as it is arbitrary and wicked.

From one source of uneasiness and apprehension, I will at once relieve you. I am not going to raise the veil which covers the traits of your private character, or the scenes of your private life. Your *public* conduct alone, shall be the subject of my relation.

It is a remarkable fact in your history, (and a very unfortunate one,) that your first entrance into public life, brought with it dissension and division into the republican party.—The consequences were foreseen and deprecated; and

have been experienced, and severely felt by every body but yourself. But you, far from lamenting, have only sought to intail the curse upon us. Until that time, we had been perfectly united. The opinion of the majority was respected by all; for all were attached to the Republican cause, and its principles. We cannot recollect the happy unanimity which then prevailed in our councils, without being shocked and mortified at the broils and divisions you have produced amongst us, and by means of which, our strength and our cause have been prostrated and disgraced.

In the year 1804, while you were clerk of the court of common pleas for this county, the death of the late Governor Potter, one of our Senators in Congress, and the expiration of the term for which the other Senator, Mr. Ellery, had been chosen, occasioned two vacancies, to be filled by our General Assembly. We met in Convention, and were about to select the candidates as usual, by a majority of the votes, when, to our astonishment, we were told by your friends, that, the doings of the majority would not be binding upon them.

This was the first time such a declaration had been made, or such a spirit had appeared among us. Your modest and temperate demand was, that, (the opinion of the Majority notwithstanding) you should be chosen in the place of, and in opposition to, Mr. Ellery; and that he should not be chosen at all.

The conduct and services of Mr. Ellery had given general satisfaction. He was esteemed by the administration, and possessed the confidence of the people. He had moreover been a peculiar object of federal persecution, and his private interests had been greatly reduced by his exertions in our cause. Every effort therefore was made to pacify you. The place of Governor Potter was offered to you.—All would not do. You insisted upon controlling the whole Republican party, and making them comply with your individual wishes. And because they could not, in justice or principle, submit to your arbitrary commands, you came out under the banners of their enemies, and were actually put into the office by the federalists, in opposition to the majority of the republican party. This, Sir, was the first act of your political life; in which you gave yourself as an instrument into the hands of our enemies, to divide and triumph over us. Does this conduct confirm, or does it falsify, the declaration contained in your celebrated letter of the 30th March, 1810. "*My principles have been dis-*

tinctly, unequivocally and uniformly, Republican." You were chosen Senator for six years, and Republicans indulged the hope that you were satisfied, and would no more disturb their peace. They were disappointed. In 1805 we sustained a loss in the death of Gov. Fenner, your father, which you have never ceased to teach us how to feel and appreciate. The wound you had given the party, now broke out afresh. The consequence was, we were defeated in part of our proxy of 1806—no Governor was chosen, But in the choice of the Senate we were successful; and the following Gentlemen were chosen; whose names I present to you, that you may again see to whom it was that you applied the epithets, I shall presently quote from another celebrated letter of yours. They were,

Henry Smith,	Joseph Cundall,
Thomas G. Pitman,	James Aldrich,
Waterman Tibbits,	William Waterman,
Daniel Champlin,	Oliver Gardner,
John D'Wolf,	Samuel Hoxsie,

When you concluded, the next year, to relinquish your seat in Congress, that you might assume the reins of government at home, by right of inheritance; and were consulted by your friends, as to the senate you would have selected, you replied, in that noted letter just alluded to, and which was published shortly after, and never denied; was seen by hundreds, and is now in existence, under your own hand; in these words. *"I shall endeavor to agree on something; as to myself, by God! I will not serve with that Senate, even should I be elected. I am foolish enough, God knows: but not so abandoned."*

The Gentlemen thus treated by you, were the six first named in the above list. And their crime was, that they were among that rebublican majority who in 1804, did not think it right that a majority should be compelled to submit unconditionally, and against their own sentiments, to the mere will of any individual. For this you proscribed and denounced them. You succeeded in turning them all from their places in the Senate. You triumphed over them Sir, but how did you triumph? Did you convince the Republican party that those men were unworthy of their confidence? No. Republicans, by a great majority, supported them. How then did you succeed, we ask? You sold yourself, Sir, absolutely sold yourself, a second time to Federalists. You again applied, by your friend James Aldrich to the federal party, and made direct propositions for an union with them; the sum of which was, that the federalists

should support you at the head of their prox, and in return shou'd nominate four or five federal Senators to displace as many in the then republican Senate. We have no means of knowing all the articles of your treaty, otherwise than as we may judge from its subsequent execution. By that it would appear, that a general division was to be made of all offices between the federalists and your personal adherents. This league, which has since (for notoriety) been called the *coalition*, was in truth nothing else than a naked undisguised combination with our enemies against the republican party.

As soon as this agreement was completed, we saw the *coalition Prox*, with you at its head, and with federalists arrayed against republicans. These were the men to whom you gave the places of the republican Senators of the preceding year—*Moses Lippitt, James Rhodes, Daniel Babcock, William Reynolds, William Anthony, Christopher Fowler*, and *Thomas B. Hazard*. The ensuing elections by the General Assembly were of the same cast. Republicans, in every corner of the State, fell under a general proscription, and “the high contracting parties,” divided the spoil. Once more, Sir,—your declaration, that your “*principles were unequivocally and uniformly republican* :” was it true, or was it false? Your friends have apologized, or accounted, for some of your extravagancies by imputing them to the heat of passion, and to an unbending pride and obstinacy of temper; but the conduct here described deprives of even of this plea, poor as it would be, if true. What sense of pride or manly spirit was there in your tame submissions to the federalists—the enemies of the cause you professed—enemies of the general government—enemies of all your friends! Was it pride or passion that made you become the servile tool of such men? No:—it was mean selfishness and base revenge—and above all, it was a want of honor and honest principles. The next year (1808) you printed and supported the same prox, with Simeon Martin, (another federalist) in the room of Mr. Taber for Deputy-Governor. Towards the close of this year, the federalists began to threaten you, particularly that section of them which had been averse to the coalition;—and those who had formed it, now charged you openly with prevarication. In 1809 they were about attacking you, when to appease them you made new and further submissions, and agreed to make a sacrifice of two of your most intimate friends; James Aldrich and Mr. Thomas B. Hazard. Accordingly the names of those gentlemen were

stricken out of the prox ; and Mr. Jeremiah Brown, (another federalist) and Mr. Job Randall, (call him what you please) were put into their places. And this prox, containing now a strong federal majority—the same prox, which the *next year* you denominated “*the federal Prox,*” —this Prox you then printed, supported and voted for.—And that too, against a republican Prox with yourself at its head.

And now, Sir, permit me to ask you, upon what principle of gratitude was it that you dismissed James Aldrich—the old and well tried friend of your father and yourself? indeed, whose devotion to your father was the cause of his adhering to you even in your apostacy.—And Thomas B. Hazard, another firm friend, why was he sacrificed? I am not complaining of his fate. But your conduct to him makes a feature in your character which must not be omitted. He had long been the tried friend of your family ; and many a year, on critical occasions, he had exerted himself by day and by night, in your father’s cause and in yours.—And, strange to tell—the very act for which you gave him up was, a service rendered to yourself and at your request. He had offended the federalists by voting against their candidate, Mr. Malbone, as Senator to Congress, and against the famous embargo resolutions ; both of which he did, not only from sentiment, but by your particular request and solicitation. To command you to sacrifice this friend, because he had served you and done what you had requested—was humbling and dishonoring you as thoroughly as if they had required you to receive stripes, or to perform any menial office. And for you to consent to make this sacrifice of your friend to save yourself, was grossly selfish, mean and ungrateful.

I wonder, Sir, if you now expect this gentleman to support you, on this trying occasion? If you do not ; what reason or right have you to expect it from these Republicans, whom you have treated, if possible, even worse than that?

Your history, and the history of your *Coalition*, now draws to a close. You had thus far continued in a state of mortification and disgrace, from the commencement of your political career, and had become tired of your bondage to the federalists. They, on their part, had long charged you with equivocation and treachery. They were willing, however, to continue you in their service, as long as you continued to renew your annual fealty to them—and, (laughable enough,) they affected to be upon honor

with you, and not to be the first to break the league.— They therefore, it seems, when about settling their prox for last year, sent their committee to you, to receive your customary submission. You kept them at bay, neither declining nor agreeing to their terms—pretending that the chief magistrate ought not to take part in elections!!— They suspected, and examined you closely—telling you they had heard you intended to come out in favor of the Republican Prox. You protested you had never made any such declaration. This management succeeded, and they continued you at the head of their prox. Having finished this game with the federalists, you now had another to play with Republicans. At the Republican Convention held in February, 1810, a prox of General Officers, composed entirely of Republicans, was *unanimously* agreed upon. In this prox, Mr. Daniel Champlin was placed as Lieutenant-Governor, and Mr. Henry Smith as first Senator. Republicans now made another effort to reclaim you. They “submitted this prox to you with a request that you would stand at the head of it: *which you flatly refused*,” unless “Mr. Champlin and Mr. Smith would give up, and allow Messrs. Wilbour and J. B. Howell to come in their places, and advise others of their friends who had been put in the list of Senators to decline also.” Deacon Vinson of Newport was one of the proscribed Senators—to him you “*objected that he was a relation of Mr. Christopher Ellery*!” Those gentlemen had too much patriotism, (even if they had been desirous of office, which they were not,) to be influenced in their conduct by personal motives. They cheerfully acquiesced, and were all dismissed from the prox at your command. How different was their conduct from yours!— You arbitrarily opposed your own selfish and capricious will to the unanimous vote and wishes of the Republican party and compelled them to submit to your dictates. Your trimming policy, between federalists and republicans, on this occasion, was mean, cowardly and unprincipled. It however answered your purpose; and you found yourself at the head of both proxies. When all this was settled, and you were no longer in danger of being opposed, a short time before the day of election, you made bold to publish your celebrated letter in the *Phœnix*, in which you bravely bid defiance to your old friends, the federalists; and protested that *you were not a federalist*. Sir, did you ever know a real republican reduced to the necessity of giving public notice in a newspaper, that he *was not a federalist*? Having withheld your recantation until it was too late for them to oppose you, you exulted in having thus out-managed them.—Perhaps too, you thought it to your credit that you did not quit the service until you discovered pretty sure symptoms of a disposition to dismiss you from

it—and that your indentures would not be renewed after the year. This however, is an affair between yourselves, and with which we have nothing to do ; for we have not found, in this instance, the adage to be true—we have gained nothing by your quarrels. How such a league as that between you and the federalists was formed, or how it was broken, is a matter of very little importance, so far as your comparative guilt is the question. It was perfectly natural that such a combination should ere long come to an end. It was a league of mischief, not cemented by any union of honest views, interests or principles. It was also as natural that it should end as it did—in the mutual hatred of the criminal parties.

You and the Federalists, had each a distinct purpose to serve ; and united only in your means. *Their* object was to govern ; and they made use of *you* as their instrument. *Your* object, too, was to govern, and also to wreak vengeance on those against whom you had imbibed a personal enmity. And republicans were equally the object of your oppression. It was natural that this combination should end as soon as either of you thought yourselves strong enough to succeed without the aid of the other. You now believe that you have arrived at this “fullness of power.” Having for four years oppressed and persecuted republicans, you believe them sufficiently humbled and broken down in their spirits to be governed by you without the aid of your federal allies ; whom you have therefore disbanded. Your whole conduct to republicans since your rupture with the federalists ; particularly your contemptuous and overbearing treatment of the republican convention as above related—and again your most arbitrary and corrupt conduct last October, in the choice of a Senator to Congress, when you again set us all at defiance and compelled us to abandon the man of our choice and to elect only such a man as you commanded: all proves most clearly, that, you hold republicanism itself only as your pastime ; and republicans as your slaves. You have no idea of their exercising any freedom of opinion. They are only to obey ; and to act as your mercenaries. *Them* you are to govern by your frowns and nods ; and *with them*, are you to govern others who may dare to oppose you. This, Sir, is the exact character and policy of despots—great and small. Republicans will never choose for their master a man who has himself been a voluntary slave to federalists. If you had sincerely become a correct republican, you would, upon leaving the federalists, have thought it sufficient grace and favor to have been received and acknowledged as a *Republican Citizen* ; and would have retired, at least for a time, to a state of probation. But instead of this—having stoutly fought against us for four years, you come, a fresh de-

serter from the enemy's ranks, and claim—not to become one among Republicans ; but to command and govern them. And, Sir, the policy upon which you assume all this authority and imperiousness, is the most unprincipled and despicable that was ever adopted by any man. Every party you enter, (and it is nothing to you what party,) you attempt to govern by threatening to fly back to their enemies, if they do not quietly submit to your control.—This same corrupt policy you practised last October, to compel Republicans to abandon their candidate for Senator. Both you and your friend Aldrich then threatened, that if Col. Smith was not given up, you would not vote for him, or would vote against him. By which means you would have enabled the federalists again to succeed. And this too was after your pretended rupture with the federalists. Such policy, Sir, is devoid of all principle ; and he who practices it, is ready to be tampered with, and bought by all parties.—He holds himself up, as one who has his price. To put ourselves and our cause into the hands and power of such a man, would be to relinquish, at once, the very name and privileges of republicans ; and to realize upon ourselves, the fable of the frogs and the crane.

Sir, it is the language of almost the whole Republican party I am speaking to you. It is time you listened to it. You have proved the curse and the Judas of the Republican cause.—Act out the character, Sir, and like Judas, retire. It is the only service you can now render us. Once more relieved from your baleful influence, Republicanism would again revive and triumph.

Here, Sir, I leave you.—This history of you is somewhat long, but it is probably the last that will ever be written.

A REPUBLICAN.

Testimony of Old School Democrats concerning

James Fenner.

The following hand-bill was printed and circulated through the State at the spring election, in the year 1811, when James Fenner was dismissed by the people from the office of Governor.

FREEMEN OF THE STATE OF RHODE-ISLAND.

Have you forgotten what James Fenner has said of more than one of the men who compose the democratic prox ? These are his words, to which he has affixed his signature, and the paper exists, to confront those who deny it. "I shall endeavor to agree on something ; as to myself, by God ! I will not serve with that Senate : even should I be elected. I am foolish enough, God knows ; but not so abandoned."

What his party think of him, the following letter will satisfy every candid, thinking man :

"TO THE REPUBLICAN CITIZENS OF THE STATE OF RHODE-ISLAND.

Having been informed, that, in different parts of the State, reports were circulated, with an intention to induce the belief that we have become reconciled to the re-election of Governor Fenner, and believing it

possible that misrepresentations of the truth may bear upon the approaching election, in a manner favorable to him, we hereby declare that we remain firm and determined in our opposition, convinced that republicanism can only be revived, in this State, by the prostration of his Excellency. Your friends and fellow citizens,

(Signed)

Henry Smith,
Christopher Ellery,
Seth Wheaton,
Samuel Thurber,
James Pettey.

Thomas Sessions,
John T. Spalding,
Henry Wheaton,
William Peckham,

Providence, April 13th, 1811,"

TO HIS EXCELLENCY JAMES FENNER.

SIR—It is unfortunate for us, that the prediction of one of the republican party of 1811, has not been verified, and, that it has become the duty of a republican of 1831 to continue the narrative of your political life—to record more recent bargains and coalitions with federalists, and new acts of treason, duplicity and proscription towards the members of that party from whom you now demand support, as you demanded it in 1811. What, sir, have you done for that party within the last twenty years that can restore you to their confidence? Have you healed their dissensions by the suppression of your personal resentments and the re-establishment of that truly republican principle of nomination by the voice of the majority? Have you faithfully supported republicans, duly nominated by the republican party, or have you supported federalists? Have you respected the opinions and conformed to the wishes of republicans on general politics, or have you slavishly adopted the opinions and the views of federalists? It is on these points that I now propose to scrutinize your conduct.

It was justly said of you in 1811, that, as you were elected to the Senate of the United States in 1804 by federalists, and to the Governor's chair in 1807 by federalists, you had never felt yourself safe in the hands of the republican party—that you had rather chosen to depend on your personal retainers and a coalition with the federalists, than on the strength of Republican principles or the fidelity of those who professed them. Your subsequent political career has furnished new and abundant evidence of the truth of that observation. You have never obtained, and you never can obtain political office without a coalition with the enemies of the republican party. Why? For the most obvious reason in the nature of things: You will not be governed by republican usages. You are determined to be nothing less than a dictator and a tyrant. Your will, not *theirs* as expressed by their delegates in Convention, must be the paramount law.

You refused the nomination of the republican party in 1815 and 16, because no coalition could be made with the federalists. They had their own candidate to support, and their leaders had not forgotten your treason in 1810. When Mr Potter was overthrown by Governor Knight, in 1818, you began to hope that he would feel the necessity of a new arrangement with you and yours; but Mr Potter kept you at a distance. He was not yet so much reduced as to be willing to trust you again. Two years after, you had him on your own terms. Mr Hunter fell a victim to this new conjunction, and the people of the state were outraged by the election of James D'Wolf to the senate of the U. States. The terms of this bargain are known. Potter was to be chosen to the seat then occupied by Mr Burrill, yourself and D'Wolf were to support his election. D'Wolf was to resign after his second or third session, and Potter and his federalists were to assist in giving you his seat. The sudden death of Mr Burrill and the election of Gov. Knight to his place, frustrated this arrangement. Mr Potter complained that you had not lived up to the spirit of the compact, and prepared to strengthen himself by a new coalition, from which yourself were excluded. You had so much respect for his party tactics as to decline a new nomination to the chair. Yet you had the address to keep your own party together—to put up a man of straw, and to dissipate the ill-concerted scheme of coalition. Both Mr Potter and yourself now discovered, that neither could succeed in his plans without the assent and co-operation of the other, and you once more came together.

By the terms of this new compact, Gov. Knight was to be sacrificed to Mr Potter's extreme anxiety for a seat in the senate, and yourself were promised the chair of state, so soon as the people should become so thoroughly mortified and humbled by the grotesque figure by whom it was then occupied, as to be willing to take you for a substitute. This, sir, accounts for the fact, that in the contest between Gov. Knight and Mr Potter for the office of senator, the former gentleman received a majority of only one, when the apparent republican majority in committee of both houses was much more considerable. On the part of yourself and your personal retainers, the terms of the compact with Potter were strictly fulfilled, and that gentleman received the votes of the three senators of Providence county,—but the D'Wolf men were so narrowly watched that they could not comply with the directions of their master; and a federalist, on whom Mr Potter had counted as a matter of course, deserted to his competitor. It is also understood, that one of the federal representatives from Providence voted for Mr Knight. Had the federalists continued to vote together as a party, and had the stipulations of the traitors to the republican cause been exactly fulfilled, Mr Potter would have re-

ceived a majority of five or seven in committee, when the republican majority ought to have been as much. This, sir, is the amount of your gratitude to Gov. Knight and his family, for the uniform and unwavering support which you and yours had always received at their hands.

That Mr Potter, though defeated, was fully satisfied with the conduct of your personal friends in this affair, is apparent from subsequent events. When the people would no longer tolerate Gov. Gibbs in the chair, and every thing was prepared according to previous arrangements, that dignified personage was permitted to retire to private life; and you, supported by Mr Potter, did not hesitate to accept a nomination to the office of chief magistrate. Thus reinstated, after what you and your family analysts may call an *interregnum* of thirteen years, you prepared, with fresh alacrity and a considerable accession of influence, to gratify Mr Potter's impatience for a seat in the senate. It was settled that Mr D'Wolf should resign, and that Mr Potter should take his place. In order further to conciliate that gentleman, Wilkins Updike, a renegade federalist, but still, in the republican ranks, (his retainer and dependant,) was nominated for the place of Attorney General. Against this nomination the people had the firmness to rebel, and to elect Gen. Green to the office by a large majority. Mr Potter was thus deprived of the official influence and assistance of a man who, though not at all qualified for the *professional* duties of the office, could have made himself useful to Potter's political designs.

The subsequent contests between Messrs. Potter and Robbins, are still fresh in our recollection. I will not recount the disgraceful attacks upon the personal and professional character of his competitor, by which Mr. Potter made a most desperate attempt to carry his election. Retributive justice was, on that occasion, as prompt and overwhelming as it is always certain. Which of these gentlemen, sir, was the candidate of the Republican party, and what was *your* conduct towards a man who had received the nomination of that party, according to established usage? You knew, sir, at the session of October, 1825, when this contest begun, that Mr. Potter and other federalists had conspired with John R. Waterman, and other of your personal adherents, to attack Mr. Robbins; that they were taking *ex parte* depositions without the knowledge of that gentleman. By whose advice and influence was the election put off to give Mr. Potter time to get in his evidence from various quarters, and, thus fortified to take his enemy at disadvantage, and, as he thought, unprepared? What did Waterman, Nathan Brown, Isaac Wilbor and Daniel Champlin? What would either of them have *dared* to do, without your sanction! Tell us not, sir, that these men

were free agents, and each, according to his own views of the case, did what was right in his own eyes! It was with *your* knowledge and direction, and in pursuance of *your* compact with the great enemy of the republican party, that they did what they did; that an old school republican, whose eloquence had vindicated the honor of the father in the Dorrance trial, was thus rewarded by the son.

Again, in 1826, when Mr. Robbins was up for re-election to the Senate, who were most active in the cause of Mr. Potter? His adherents among the federalists, and yours among the republicans. He set up and supported a newspaper, and appointed a federalist, (whom he has since rewarded) to write *him up* and Mr. Robbins *down*. He entered the field, personally and under his own signature, in a series of most rancorous attacks upon the character of Mr. Robbins. By whom was that newspaper taken, patronized and circulated? By Mr. Potter's friends and yours. By whom were a number of republicans named as candidates, to divide the strength of the republican party, whilst Mr. Potter should keep the federalists in compact array? By your personal adherents, who would not have done it without your consent.

Who were they sir, that at the October session 1828, joined Mr Potter in his plan of making Mr Searle, a federalist Senator in place of Gov. Knight? Your adherents.—Why was this attempt made? was there no republican whom you could have made Senator, if Gov. Knight had chosen to retire? Where was Judge Eddy, Judge Pitman, or Secretary Bowen, either of whom should have been preferred by you to Mr Searle, all of whom stood fair for the support of republicans? Neither of these gentlemen would have suited Mr Potter; and Mr Potter must be conciliated and kept in good humor, whatever might become of the republican party. Mr Searle was a close adherent of Mr Potter and of that gentleman's personal friends in Providence; he was an anti-tariff man, and might, as subsequent events have proved, have been made a Jackson man, in case it should be found convenient to make him so. It was fortunate for the republican party, and for all the people of the State, that Gov. Knight was induced to become a candidate for re-election, and that he was re-elected.

And what, Sir, let me ask, has been your conduct towards the republican party with respect to general politics? Have you conformed to its express will, or have you exerted your influence, both personal and official, to defeat that will? Let your deportment during the two last elections of President, answer. You were in favor of Mr. Crawford and opposed to Mr. Adams. You were in favor of General Jackson and opposed to Mr. Adams, though the great body of the people were, from the beginning, in favor of Mr.

Adams. Your personal influence and that of your particular friends was constantly employed to raise recruits for the Crawford and Jackson standard. You promised office to some, you threatened to take office from others, to induce them to enlist. With a house of representatives and a senate opposed to you, this game was constantly played to keep friends with Mr. Potter. You found that you could perform neither your promises or your threats, and this made you restive. You resolved to *reform* the two houses of the Assembly. You succeeded with the Senate, by the circulation of a defamatory pamphlet, written by Mr. Potter's man, Updike; but the representatives of the towns have continued firm. Your intolerance broke out with renewed energy at the last May election, when you supposed you had a majority in joint committee; and all who had not conformed to your views were threatened with dismissal. Some of these persons had supported you at the head of the Republican ticket; but because they would not vote for *your* [to wit the] Jackson ticket for senators, they were informed that they could not have your support for re-appointment. The present worthy sheriff of Washington County, who had always stood by you, who voted for and did every thing he could do to help you against Dr. Messer, but would not swallow the Jackson senate, was apposed by one of Mr. Potter's men. He applied to you for your influence, which you refused, to please Mr. Potter and gratify your own resentment. Happily for Mr. Peckham, he found the republicans too strong for both yourself and Potter; and was elected in spite of both.

Here, then, is a connected view, though a brief one, of the acts of your political life for twenty seven years. You were not born or educated a republican. You have never been a republican; have never respected the republican party, or conformed to republican usages. You came into public life by the votes of federalists. You were driven to retirement when federalists deserted you. You took the helm again when permitted to take it by them. You have been sustained to this moment by them, in conjunction with your family friends. To conciliate the Arch Enemy of republicanism in this State, has been the business of your life; and this you have done by the sacrifice of republicans who had been instant in the service of your father and yourself. Affront us, then, no longer, by claiming a community of feeling or opinion. When we hear your professions, we remember your acts. May this be the last time that, as a public man, Republicans will have occasion to address you.

ANOTHER REPUBLICAN.



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 111 294 6

